

300 Park Avenue 17th Floor, New York, NY 10022

Tel.: 212-RUSAMEX (212-787-2639); 212-572-6221; 212-572-6208

Fax: 212-777-6600; 212-572-6457 Telex: 425170 HQ NYC

RECEIVED

MAR 28 1996

FCC MAIL ROOM

FCC

Re: Pulevakin 8775

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Entry 15, 1996

Dear Sirs,

I came from Russia as
a refugee. I was looking for free society

ACTA Petition is an
example of communist (typical)
approach to telecommunications

Please deny this petition

Sincerely,

Alex Shul

Alexander Shulman V.P.

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

0

From: Linas Vepstas <linas@austin.ibm.com>
 To: A16.A16(rm8775)
 Date: 3/27/96 1:22pm
 Subject: VRML & Internet Chat

MAR 28 1996

RECEIVED
 3/27/96 1:22pm
 16.A16

Hi,

Below follows some extremely informal comments on RM No. 8775.

These comments concern certain products that IBM is contemplating; these comments have NOT been reviewed by management, nor have they been reviewed by an attorney; thus, these comments do NOT represent an official stance by IBM. They are rather the views of an "industry insider".

IBM is in the process of developing products that revolve around the 3D extension to the World Wide Web (WWW), known as VRML (the Virtual Reality Modeling Language). A natural use of VRML is for "social computing", that is, as a communications medium between individuals, for both entertainment and business purposes.

Current technologies achieve this goal of "social computing" by coupling "chat" to WWW and VRML. "Chat" is a generic term for several technologies that allow users to exchange short messages in real time, by typing on a computer keyboard. Chat technologies have been around for several decades. Chat differs from e-mail in that messages are posted immediately, without delay. Thus, users can "talk" by typing at the keyboard.

An "obvious" idea is to promote chat from a keyboard-typing exercise to a microphone-speech technology; this idea has been around for a decade (see the 1980's NeXT computer, for instance), but low-cost technology has not been available until recently.

My concern is that in trying to build a "collaborative computing" environment, which integrates e-mail, Usenet News, WWW, VRML, chat and "voice chat", we will be viewed as competing with the RBOC's and the Long Distance carriers in providing voice-communications services, and will be asked to pay charges/revenues/taxes/license fees for such a product. Although such a product would un-arguably allow users to engage in voice-based communications over large distances, it is not a "telephone" in any traditional sense. It is a communications product that is far richer in modes and flexibilities than what a telephone can offer, and users will use it for this richness, and not for the purpose of by-passing the established phone companies.

I do not believe that such a "social computing" product should be subject to the fees or the regulations that RBOC's and Long Distance Carriers are subject to. My belief is based on the difficulty of separating one function from another. What percentage of the product is used for voice chat, as opposed to loading web pages or roaming a VRML space, or sending e-mail? How much of this is used between two users in the same building, as opposed to users in different cities? What if one user sends "voice e-mail" (kind of like leaving a message on an answering machine) to another? Would this imply that e-mail needs regulation? What if the user uses voice to annotate, or "mark up" a document?

The FCC does not regulate the mailing of cassettes or video-tapes through the US Postal Service. The FCC does not currently regulate e-mail, whether or not such e-mail contains video or audio content. The FCC does not regulate "FTP" (File Transfer protocol) which is often used to move larger audio or video streams over the internet.

Now that technology exists to move audio and video over the internet in fractions of a second, instead of seconds, minutes or days, should the FCC start regulating? What if an "internet phone" is slowed down so that it delivers its message in seconds or minutes, instead of fractions of a second? Does it now become exempt from regulation? What if the underlying technology of the "internet phone" is changed to use the more older and less suitable FTP, telnet or HTTP interfaces, instead of the current socket technology? Would this make it exempt from regulation?

I don't believe these questions are answerable, and that the answers coming out would be artificial and highly arguable.

-- linas

Sincerely,
 Linas Vepstas

No. of Copies rec'd
 LVL:ALCDE

Linus Vepstas Graphics Architecture
IBM PPS Zip 4449 Tie Line: 678-1116
11400 Burnet Road External Phone: 1-(512)-838-1116
Austin TX 78758-4449 mail: linas@austin.ibm.com

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

From: Gary Kueber <gary@communique.net>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 3/28/96 5:07am
Subject: ACTA petition

MAR 28 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Re: RM8775

I would like to urge the FCC to disregard the ACTA petition against the use of Internet telephony products. The petition is a desperate attempt by the telephone industry to lure the government into destroying products that might cut into these companies' profits. The TELCOs are truly frightened by the prospect of new technology rendering their services archaic and overpriced - instead of adapting and competing, in the true American spirit of entrepreneurial resourcefulness, they want the government to protect their corpulent market share by bludgeoning the individual.

The fact is that the Internet Service Providers are not telephone companies. They are small companies and large companies that provide a gateway, and only a gateway, to a larger network. This network is owned by a multitude of parties, from non-TELCO corporations, to private individuals, to TELCO companies, to you, the government. The Internet is not a wholly owned consortium of anyone. People have used this network to exchange words, images, information, and yes, sound for many years now. Internet telephony technology is simply an extension of that information exchange among individuals. In 0's and 1's, it looks no different than the email people have been exchanging for 15+ years.

I would like to remind the FCC that the people hurt most by a ruling in favor of the ACTA petition would be individual consumers, who would be forced to continue to pay the outrageous prices of the TELCOs, and would see the prices of their ISPs skyrocket. It would be the ISPs who offer low prices to the consumer who would be forced out of business, allowing the TELCOs to muscle in on their territory.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter, and I urge you to do what is best for the consumers, not to protect the market share of greedy companies. POTS is, simply, the pits - they should adapt to new technology, not try to stifle it.

Sincerely,

Garril L. Kueber, Jr. gary@communique.net

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABOVE _____

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

From: The Gate <gate@id.WING.NET>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 3/28/96 2:53am
Subject: Internet Telephony

MAR 28 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Just don't do it. Internet Telephony is fine. PPhone companies are fat enough. Let the good times roll.

R. Leland Lehrman

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCOE _____

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAR 28 1996

From: Maureen Simmons <upprduck@digital.net>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 3/28/96 2:14am
Subject: Against the ACTA petition to the FCC--copy of e=mail to President Clinton

>To: clinton@whitehouse.gov
>From: upprduck@digital.net (Maureen Simmons)
>Subject: Against the ACTA petition to the FCC
>

>And so the dinosaur roars against the oncoming times! Don't be a dinosaur yourself, Mr. President. The Internet is two animals: *information and communication*. Information will one day soon cost whatever the market will bear, but communication now achieved worldwide for common man at just a basic connection charge will be the greatest peace initiative known to man.

We have arrived at the global village at last--don't cut it off to appease outmoded carriers. >

>from:

>

>THE PROVISION OF INTERSTATE AND
>INTERNATIONAL INTEREXCHANGE
>TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE VIA THE
>"INTERNET" BY NON-TARIFFED, UNCERTIFIED
>ENTITIES

>

>AMERICA'S CARRIERS TELECOMMUNICATION
>ASSOCIATION ("ACTA"),
> Petitioner

>

>Permitting long distance service to be given away is not in
>the public interest. Therefore, ACTA urges the Federal Communi-
>cations Commission ("the Commission") to exercise its jurisdic-
>tion in this matter and: issue a declaratory ruling establishing
>its authority over interstate and international telecommuni-
>cations services using the Internet; grant special relief to
>maintain the status quo by immediately stop the sale of this
>software; and institute rulemaking proceedings defining permissi-
>ble communications over the Internet.

>

How many copies read
List A16.05

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

From: <Joe.Bartlett@Mexia.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 3/27/96 8:24pm
Subject: RE RM8775 from Web Page form

MAR 28 1996

Date: Thu, 28 Mar 1996 01:24:36 GMT
Referer: <http://www.mexia.com/fcc.html>

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20541

MyOpinion Leave the Internet unregulated!
MyOpinion Submit Your Opinion

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABOVE _____

From: Anders Brownworth <anders@marvin.anders.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 3/27/96 4:56pm
Subject: RM No. 8775

RECEIVED

MAR 28 1996

Dear Sirs

Regarding the "Internet Phone" issue.

Possibly this is the issue that brings to light the point that the idea of a "single line for a single conversation" communication systems are a thing of the past. It's becoming increasingly clear to me that this kind of methodology is a dead-end. With the Internet, where location is not a limitation, the commodity is bandwidth. Competition of the future will be the issue of bandwidth pipe size rather than distance of communication. With personal computers capable of making routing decisions, routing becomes less and less the service of the telephone companies. Their primary focus, as a few of them are finding out, is going to be the issue of bandwidth size.

As the role of telecommunications companies shifts from intelligent agent to the provision of various levels of bandwidth, they see a disadvantage in the fact that they are starting to loose a small percentage of their business to "Internet Phone" type Internet programs rather than realizing that this brings up the issue of the common customer needing more and more bandwidth. I would like to discourage you from granting them licence to halt sale of "Internet Phone" programs and hardware.

I am living proof of the transition. I have a T1 in my house capable of 1.54Mb per second connected to the Internet. It's significantly more expensive than a POTS line, or ISDN. I have it because I want more bandwidth. I didn't just purchase many phone lines.

Thank you for your time.

-Anders Brownworth-

No. of Copies rec'd _____
ENCLOSURE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: Tien-Shun Yang <tyang@solar.usc.edu>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 3/27/96 12:32pm
Subject: ACTA petition

MAR 28 1996

Dear Sir/Madame:

My opinion is: any application in Internet should be respected if it following the rule of Internet. It is not fair to tariff ISP since they did not make money by Internet phone, actually they do like voice connections which take long time than e-mail. It is not fair to tariff Internet phone software vendor, since they got paid by product, not like telephone company charge customers by connection time. Furthermore, vendors did not violate any rule by the time they did development, it is a little too late to bring up this issue.

The thing we might want to look at is: if a great portion of people like to

speak via computer whereby the quality of voice is not as good as a real phone, then a new type of telephone company is gradually formed to organize

ISP all over the world, and new tariff should be enforced upon those telephone companies. Which, in my opinion, should be completely different than the current one since the technology is different. We open the telephony market for all interested parties already, and FCC may want to consider how to tariff those approach telephony business with new technologies.

All the best,

Tim Yang

No. of Copies rec'd _____
DATE _____

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAR 28 1996

From: Gary Yang <gtyang@srv.pacbell.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 3/27/96 12:08pm

FBI - LOS ANGELES
MAR 28 1996

Dear Sir/Madame:

I am working for a telephone company, however, my opinion does not stand for the company. It is inevitable that conventional telephony technology will be affected by Internet. Telephone company employees worry about losing their jobs, actually, if those who are not expand their horizontal and picking up marketable skills will lose their jobs anyway.

Information Superhighway is the top priority of Clinton's administration, to create new jobs. If we believe this is the right track, then don't overprotect the telephone company, let new applications on Internet freely and widely grow.

We have to keep in mind, by the time of the debut of the current telephone technology, post offices did not file a petition. Also, it's about time this platform to be challenged by new technology. The world wide telephony business revenue is 1.5 trillion, and US takes 0.8 trillion, I don't want to see other countries replace our position by deploying new technologies which are suppressed in state due to the "fear" of current telephone companies. They, or my company, should try to study the Internet technology and improve the current telephony infrastructure.

Regards,

Dr. Gary Yang

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABOVE

From: <teroger@pixi.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 3/27/96 10:51am
Subject: ACTA Petition

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAR 28 1996

To Whom It May Concern:

I can hardly wait until all Internet access is provided via cable and wireless communication networks so that I don't have to put up with the kind of juvenile, monopolistic threatening that the phone companies have come up with in their ACTA Petition. I truly believe that the ACTA Petition is a waste of your time and everyone else's time. The only thing the phone companies will accomplish is a more rapid implementation of alternative Internet access methods. Then their petition and any action resulting from it will be meaningless. Why should I pay twice to use my phone line?

Best regards,
Celeste Rogers
94-731 Kime Street
Waipahu, HI 96797-1273

1
Mr. of Copies rec'd
11176002

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

From: <nyoung@chatlink.com>
To: A4.A4(ssegal)
Date: 3/27/96 9:15pm
Subject: Chairman's Column Comments

MAR 28 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Norm Young (nyoung@chatlink.com) writes:

Dear Chairman Hundt,

Re:Rulemaking No. 8775 (FCC's response to America's Carriers Telecommunication Association's petition of March 4, 1996 to restrict the use of telephony products on the Internet.)

I am alarmed by the willingness of the FCC to strangle one of the newest industries on the Internet...the software products that allow ordinary citizens to use the Internet to provide voice long distance services. I am completely amazed how well this technology works (more reliable than the phone network) and how incredibly cheap it is compared to standard long distance rates. as a matter of fact, I'm so amazed at the price difference that I'm tempted to think that the FCC has been complicit with the large long-distance companies in a scheme to keep long distance rates artificially high! I am especially amazed, considering considering what you, Mr. Hunt have said about the virtues of competition in your the recently past Telecomm Bill:

"The new law is based on competition. The goal is to let anyone enter any communications business -- to let any communications business compete in any market against any other. In the communications field, to paraphrase the President, the era of big government is over -- at least the era of big government management of state-supported monopolies is over. Competition can bring more choices, better quality services, and lower prices."

Your agency's narrow response time required (comments accepted until April 8, 1996) and it's lack of a clearly set out _Internet_ email address for comments smells strongly of an attempt to engage in undemocratic policies.

Finally, consider, if the FCC tries to ban the use of software telephony products, it will not stop the adoption of these technologies...it will just drive those software companies out of our country and the use of the software underground. It's far too good of fit with the emerging ubiquitous computer network to just go away.

Thanks for your attention to this matter,

Norm Young
Oregon, USA

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: cl1-p8.chatlink.com
Remote IP address: 205.139.105.208

No. of Copies rec'd _____
L11 ABCDE